

### REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 11, 2004 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1 to 16, 18 to 36 and 38 to 54 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 18, 21, 31, 38, 41 and 46 are the independent claims. Claims 17 and 37 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter. Claims 11, 18, 31, 38 and 48 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action raises objections to the specification and the drawings. In response, Applicant amends the specification. Withdrawal of the objections is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication in the Office Action that Claims 7, 8, 11 to 16, 18, 27, 28, 31 to 36, 38, 46, 47 and 49 to 52 are allowable if rewritten. Claims 11, 18, 31, 38 and 46 have been rewritten in independent form and are believed to be in condition for allowance. In conjunction with rewriting Claims 11 and 38, Claims 17 and 37 are being cancelled.

By the Office Action, Claims 1 to 6, 9, 10, 17, 19 to 26, 29, 30, 37, 39, 40 to 45, 48, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More particularly, Claims 1 to 4, 10, 21 to 24, 30, 41 to 44 are rejected over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,120 (Falk) and U.S. Patent No. 5,200,816 (Rose), Claims 5, 25 and 45 are rejected over Falk, Rose and U.S. Patent No. 6,181,354 (Swan), Claims 6, 9, 26, 29, 53 and 54 are rejected over Falk, Rose and U.S. Patent No. 5,227,872 (Yamaguchi), Claims 17, 19, 20, 37, 39 and 40 are rejected over Falk, Rose and U.S. Patent 5,781,206 (Edge), and Claim 48 is rejected over Falk,

Rose and U.S. Patent No. 5,621,873 (Tanaka). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns storing a color patch definition together with spatial information and measurement information for the color patch. More particularly, the color patch definition is initially stored, and as the spatial and measurement information is obtained, it is stored with the color patch definition.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is possible to use the stored information for multiple hardware/software platforms to characterize a color device. In addition, during generation of the stored information, the stored information can be examined to determine a state of the generation based on missing information, for example.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 defines a method is defined of integrating characterization information associated with a target image for use with a color reproduction device. According to the method, a measurement store is obtained which has an entry corresponding to a color patch of a target image, the entry comprising a color value of the color patch. The entry is updated in the measurement store to include spatial information of the color patch in the target image. A measurement of the color patch in the target image is obtained, and the entry is updated in the measurement store to include the measurement.

The applied art, namely Falk and Rose, is not seen to disclose each and every feature of the claimed method, particularly with respect to the features of a store in which an entry is updated and includes a color value of a color patch, spatial information of the color patch in a target image, and measurement of the color patch in the target image.

Falk is seen to describe printer calibration, whereby a calibration image printed by the printer is scanned by a scanner to generate a calibrated printer profile. As is described commencing at col. 8, line 8 of Falk and shown in Figure 5, color patches and registration marks 502 are printed and used to calibrate a color device. However, as it is conceded in the Office Action, Falk is not seen to store spatial information in a measurement store. In addition, nothing in Falk is seen to disclose a measurement store having an entry storing a color value of the color patch, the entry being updated to include spatial information of the color patch and measurement information of the color patch.

Rose is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Falk. More particularly, the cited portion of Rose i.e., col. 26, lines 25 to 34, is merely seen to describe defining colored locations in images 218 and 220. However, defining locations within a printed image is not seen to disclose a measurement store having an entry storing a color value of the color patch, the entry being updated to include spatial information of the color patch and measurement information of the color patch.

The remaining applied art, i.e., Swan, Yamaguchi, Edge and Tanaka, has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the deficiencies noted with respect to Falk and Rose.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 21 and 41 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each

dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 80613v1